DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 471 656 TM 034 685

AUTHOR	Harrison, Judy A.; McAfee, Harold; Caldwell, Ana
TITLE	Examining, Developing, and Validating the Interview for Admission into the Teacher Education Program.
PUB DATE	2002-11-00
NOTE	18p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southeastern Region Association for Teacher Educators (Hot Springs, AR, November, 2002). For another paper on the same study, see TM 034 684.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Admission; *Interviews; *Preservice Teachers; *Reliability; *Scoring Rubrics; *Teacher Education; Validity

ABSTRACT

To improve the admission process for teacher education at Henderson State University, Arkansas, and to ensure that teacher education candidates have appropriate dispositions for teaching, this study investigated the interview was an admissions criterion. Criteria for assessment and levels of proficiency were determined. A scoring rubric was developed and validated, and a training video depicting "unsatisfactory," "basic," and "proficient" candidate responses during an interview was produced. Rater reliability was examined in the rating of 130 candidates, and a basis for further research was established to continue to develop the interview process. Seven appendixes contain the scoring rubric, evaluation comments about the interview training, interview rating sheets, and a candidate result summary. (Author/SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 471 656

EXAMINING, DEVELOPING, AND VALIDATING THE INTERVIEW FOR ADMISSION INTO THE TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM

Presented by

Dr. Judy A. Harrison
Director, Teacher Education Admissions/Clinical Experiences
Teachers College
Henderson State University

Dr. Harold McAfee
Assistant Professor
Health, Physical Education, and Recreation
Teachers College
Henderson State University

Dr. Ana Caldwell
Associate Professor
Curriculum and Instruction
Teachers College
Henderson State University

SRATE ANNUAL MEETING
Hot Springs, Arkansas
November 1, 2002

TM034685

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
J. A. Harrison
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

Although there is a dearth of current research and literature concerning admission standards for teacher education, a review of the literature revealed that the interview is still an important criterion for candidate selection into teacher education. In order to improve the admission into teacher education process at Henderson State University and to ensure that teacher education candidates have appropriate dispositions for teaching, the interview as an admissions criterion was examined. Criteria for assessment and levels of proficiency were determined. A scoring rubric was developed and validated, and a training video depicting "unsatisfactory," "basic," and "proficient" candidate responses during an interview was produced. Rater reliability was examined, and a basis for further research was established.

Introduction

Since the early 1980s states have reacted to public pressure to improve the quality of teacher education. Ashburn and Fisher (1984) correctly predicted that "if we do not assume a more vigorous 'gatekeeper' function, we are threatened by a growing number of interveners making judgments for us." Soon after the release of *A Nation at Risk* (1983) and other reports critical of the quality of American public education, states rushed into adopting "quick fix" measures to satisfy the public's hunger for greater accountability. Since quantitative measures, such as standardized testing, are easy to enforce and administer and are relatively inexpensive (*Journal of Teacher Education*, 1994), many states have adopted minimal scores for entry into teacher education programs and minimal exit scores for licensure. Literature sources vary on the exact numbers of states requiring entry and exit testing, possibly because there are no clear definitions, and states are currently in flux as many of them are reestablishing standards for teacher licensure (*Quality Counts 2000; NASDTEC Manual*, 2000).

Indeed, standardized test results of basic and cognitive skills seem to give legislators definitive commentary to feed their constituents about the "quality" of American education. Few people would argue the merit of American teachers possessing at least a basic level of proficiency in reading, writing, and mathematics. Yet, many professionals in education believe that standardized testing of basic and cognitive skills may not be a true indicator of one's future success as a teacher (Beswick, 1990; Hilliard, 1986, cited in *Admission to Teacher Education Programs*, 1994; Vaughn, 2000) and is, at best, only a starting point for determining who is likely to become an effective classroom teacher. Practitioners know that there are affective characteristics of effective teachers that are as essential as basic and cognitive skills. These characteristics, however, cannot be measured by standardized testing. Haberman (1991) states, "They [prospective teachers] should be screened not for the attributes that will make them successful university students but for the qualities that will make them excellent teachers of children and youth."

Assuming that certain affective skills and dispositions are important to teacher candidate selection, these questions should be posed:

- What are these affective skills and dispositions?
- How can they be assessed?
- Who is qualified to assess them?
- How can the results of the assessment be used in the selection process of teacher education candidates?

In a conference sponsored by the National Institute of Education in 1984 (Ashurn and Fisher), there was a consensus that these considerations were important. Yet, there is a dearth of research and literature concerning what schools of education are doing concerning affective measures for admission into their programs.

Arkansas, as well as some other states, began examining quality standards for teacher education before the release of *A Nation at Risk*. In 1979, the Arkansas State Legislature passed ACT 162 requiring any person seeking certification after January 1, 1980, to "take and complete the National Teacher Examination or similar examination." ACT 162 and subsequent legislation led to Arkansas' setting of quantitative standards for teacher licensure that included minimal scores on basic skills, subject matter, and pedagogical skills tests, as well as a minimum grade point average of 2.50.

Although quantitative measures, such as test scores, may be predictors of one's future success as a teacher, professional educators argue against their use as sole determinants of one's worthiness of a teacher license. In fact, NCATE recommendations call for a variety of assessment measures (Vaughn, 2000).

Agreeing with NCATE recommendations and believing that affective measures are as important as cognitive measures for admission into the teaching profession, Teachers College, Henderson State University, has included affective, as well as the state-mandated cognitive, requirements for admission into its Teacher Education Program.

The Interview as an Admissions Criterion

The process for admission into the Teacher Education Program and internship at Teachers College, Henderson State University involves several steps. Some of these are strictly objective: meeting or exceeding Arkansas set scores on all parts of the PRAXIS I and the appropriate Principles of Learning and Teaching and subject area assessments of the PRAXIS II, having a 2.50 or better G.P.A., and successful completion of general education and major courses. These measures may provide evidence of candidates' content knowledge and professional and pedagogical knowledge; however, with the exception of part of the Principles of Learning and Teaching assessment, they are not designed to indicate a person's disposition toward teaching. Disposition is a key component of Standard 1 of NCATE 2000. Teachers College, Henderson uses two indicators of a candidate's disposition toward teaching.

One is the use of the Guillford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey. Students who score outside the realm of what is considered an appropriate temperament for teaching are asked to take the survey again. If the indicators once again show that the student's temperament is outside the acceptable range for teaching, the student is counseled about whether teaching is an appropriate career choice. However, no student is kept out of the Teacher Education Program solely because of a score on the Guillford-Zimmerman.

The other approach to determining a student's disposition toward teaching is the interview for admission into the Teacher Education Program. Although his work focuses on the recruitment and selection of teachers for urban schools, Haberman (1987) stresses that, outside of observing teacher education candidates' work with children and youth, an interview that students can fail should be part of every selection process. He claims that an interview can identify "extreme" candidates who should not be teachers. For several years HSU has interviewed students before admitting them into the program. Students were interviewed by an HSU faculty member and a teacher or administrator from a public partnership school. They were rated on a scale of 1 (Unacceptable) to 5 (Excellent) on the categories of verbal fluency, spoken English usage, clarity of expression, poise/confidence, personal appearance, response logic, response relevance, and professional awareness. Candidates "passed" the interview if they averaged a score of 3.5 overall. However, there were several problems with this system.

One apparent problem was that a student could receive an unacceptable in something as important as spoken English usage and still pass the interview. Another problem was inconsistency in rating. Raters were given no precise definitions of "unacceptable" or "excellent." That factor, combined with the expected inconsistency in scoring among raters, made defending a candidate's score nearly impossible. Moreover, when a student scored "marginal" or "unacceptable" on a criterion, there was no follow up or plan for remediation. Students who "failed" the interview (and those were rare) were allowed to interview again, and, to our knowledge, no one was denied admission on the basis of the interview.

At the conclusion of the Spring 2001 Interview Day, a Henderson faculty member who was one of the interviewers expressed concern about the process. He said he was uncertain about the ratings he gave the candidates and that he would have trouble defending his ratings. He asked troublesome questions such as (1) Is the system valid? (2) How are the ratings defined? (3) Why isn't there a more in-depth training session for raters? (4) Why don't we develop a video depicting "Acceptable," "Unacceptable," and "Excellent" interviews? There were no good answers to his questions. Because of the time involved in "overhauling" the system, we were tempted to ignore the questions. However, we knew that NCATE would be asking the same or similar questions, so it was time to make the necessary changes or to do away with the interview altogether. We were hesitant to eliminate the interview because we thought it was good practice for the candidates. Moreover, we felt that if we could improve the validity and reliability of the measure, that it would be a good indicator of candidate disposition (NCATE 2000, Standard 1).

Refining the Process

Because of our interest in the process, three of us volunteered to examine the process and make necessary changes. After much discussion, we decided that we did not need to try to evaluate too many attributes during a short interview and that we should determine those most important

for a prospective teacher. We finally narrowed the possibilities to five: professional awareness/interest, verbal fluency, personal appearance, personal presentation, and portfolio development. Although the portfolio component is not a "personal" attribute, we wanted the candidates to have a "real life" experience in presenting their initial work on their portfolios early in their professional education, so that they would take the development of their portfolios seriously. Also, we felt that five levels of proficiency were too many and that three levels would be sufficient. Since we use components of Charlotte Danielson's *A Framework for Teaching* for teacher intern performance assessment, we decided to borrow her terminology to identify the levels: Unsatisfactory, Basic, and Proficient.

Once the components for evaluation were determined, we decided that we needed to develop a rubric that would clarify what a "proficient," "basic," and "unsatisfactory" rating meant for professional awareness/interest, verbal fluency, personal appearance, personal presentation, and portfolio development. Dr. Ana Caldwell, assistant professor of Education, found a presentation rubric on the Internet that had been developed by Information Technology Evaluation Services, NC Department of Public Instruction. This rubric gave us some structural ideas, once we determined the criteria for evaluation. After brainstorming, we developed a rubric to assist interviewers in scoring the interview. (See Appendix A.)

We concurred that an "average" of the ratings was an inadequate indicator of what the candidate's strengths and deficiencies were. Therefore, we decided that only candidates who scored "basic" or "proficient" in every category would "pass" the interview with no conditions. Candidates who scored "unsatisfactory" in any category would be notified, counseled, and given a plan for remediation. Then the TCH Interview Committee would determine if and when the candidate met the interview requirements for admission.

Validation

In order to validate the rubric, we sent copies to Teachers' College, Henderson Administrative Team; Curriculum and Instruction faculty; Health, Physical Education, and Recreation faculty; and the Executive Council of the HSU Public School Partnership and asked for feedback. The feedback was overwhelmingly positive. (See Appendix B.) With that encouragement, the dean of Teachers College, Henderson and the chair of Curriculum and Instruction gave us permission to pilot the project during the Fall 2001 Interview Day.

Training Video

Prior to Interview Day, we asked several teacher education students to play the roles of candidates who were rated "proficient," "basic," and "unsatisfactory" during an interview while we videotaped them. We prepared a script for each student and asked him or her to dress and act according to the role he or she was assigned. During the videotaping, we discovered that most of the students did not follow the scripts and actually portrayed the character better than the one we had scripted. The student who tried to follow the script was unable to pull the performance off convincingly.

Teachers and administrators from partnership schools were invited to participate as interviewers. About 2 ½ hours before the interviews were to begin, we conducted a training session for them and the HSU faculty who would participate in the interviews. We gave them copies of the rubric

and explained how to rate each criterion. Then we showed video examples of each level of proficiency and asked the interviewers to rate each one. There was surprising consistency in the rating of each video segment. Finally, we attempted to answer the questions posed by the interviewers.

The interviews were conducted in a large banquet room, including several tables for interviews. A HSU faculty member was paired with a public school teacher at each table. HSU faculty were from the Ellis College of Arts and Sciences, as well as the Teachers College. TCH staff greeted candidates as they came to the entrance, had them fill in their name and ID number on a rating sheet (See Appendix C) for each interviewer, and sent them to an available table. During the interview, candidates responded to questions taken from a "suggested questions" list (See Appendix D) and presented their portfolios for review by the interviewers.

After the interviews, interviewers were asked to evaluate the process. Again, most response was positive (See Appendix E). One valuable incident happened during the process. HSU was undergoing a HLC visit. One of the HLC team asked to sit in on some of the interviews. She even participated by asking one young woman some questions (we were fortunate that that candidate was one of our best!). We asked her to complete an evaluation of the process. She stated that she was impressed with the process and that the only suggestion she would make would be to change "proficient" to "target," an NCATE term.

Reliability

Of the130 candidates who interviewed, 85 (65%) passed by scoring "Basic" or "Proficient" in all categories. Forty-five (35%) received a rating of "Unsatisfactory" on at least one category. To determine rater reliability, ratings among scorers were matched. An analysis of category rating matches and mismatches by interviewers revealed an 89.3% category agreement. (See Appendix F.) Although the numbers were small, the results revealed strong inter-rater reliability.

Follow -Up

As the candidates received their scores, many expressed disbelief that they had not satisfied the requirements. Most of them had never heard of anyone not "passing" the interview. As one student stated, "What happened? I don't understand. This has always been a joke."

If a candidate's only "unsatisfactory" was the portfolio, the candidate was asked to take the portfolio to the Director of Teacher Education Admissions/Clinical Experiences who examined the portfolio for completeness and accuracy. Candidates were given instructions for improvement. Once corrections were made, the candidate was awarded a "pass" for the interview. Students who scored "unsatisfactory" in professional awareness/interest, personal presentation, or personal appearance were interviewed again by the Interview Committee and given suggestions for improvement. Students who scored "unsatisfactory" in verbal fluency were counseled about the importance of excellent communication skills and were assigned to go to the Writing Center for additional help.

Overall, feedback from the process has been positive. Although some students expressed that they didn't think we should put them through such stress, we believe that impressing upon them the significance of their career choice early in their professional preparation will encourage them

to take their work seriously. And, the young man who was initially distressed when he did not pass and said, "I don't understand. This has always been a joke," later thanked us for calling his attention to some verbal fluency problems. He said that he had always been an "A" student and had never "failed" at anything, or, at least, no one had told him that he needed to improve. After his counseling session with the Committee, he thanked us and said, "I'm proud to be a part of Henderson's Teacher Education Program. I know that you are preparing me to be the best teacher possible."

Conclusion

Many states have legislated tough quantitative standards for admission into teacher education and licensure at the same time there is a nationwide shortage of teachers. In times of severe teacher shortage, the temptation may be to lower standards, but to ensure high-quality teacher education graduates, schools of education must move beyond quantitative, state-determined requirements. Believing that predictive indicators of future effectiveness as a teacher must be judged by qualitative, as well as quantitative, measures, schools of education will continue to assess the dispositions of teacher education candidates through affective means such as the interview for admission into the teacher education program. The following questions should be further researched: 1) How important is the interview for admission in determining candidate disposition for teaching? 2) What attributes should be assessed during the interview? 3) How will these attributes be assessed? 4) What should be the qualifications of the assessors? 5) How will the assessment be used? 6) How reliable is the assessment? 7) What legal implications are there when "unsatisfactory" candidates are not admitted into the program?

References

Act 162 of 1979. General Assembly of the State of Arkansas. Arkansas Statutes 80-1201.

Admission to teacher education programs: Goodlad's sixth postulate. (1994, Jan). Journal of Teacher Education ,1(45). 46-54.

Ashburn, E. A., & Fisher, R. L. (Eds.) (1984). Methods of assessing teacher education students: Conference proceedings. Washington, D. C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 255 493)

Beswick, R. (1990). Evaluating education progress. ERIC Digest Series Number EA 54. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 324 766)

Haberman, M. (1987). Recruiting and selecting teachers for urban schools. New York: ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education.

Haberman, M. (1991). The dimensions of excellence in programs of teacher education. Paper presented at the Annual Conference on Alternative Certification, South Padre Island, TX, April 10-12, 1991). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 324 766)

The NASDTEC manual on the preparation and certification of educational personnel for the year 2000. Section G. Examinations and assessments.

Quality counts 2000. Who should teach? The states decide. Executive summary. Education Week on the Web. Retrieved May 30, 2001, from the World Wide Web: http://www.edweek.org/sreports/qc00

Vaughn, M., Everhart, B., Sharpe, T, & Schimmel, C. Incorporating a multisource assessment approach in a teacher education program. (2000, Winter). Education 2(121) 339-346.

APPENDIX A

RUBRIC FOR EVALUATING THE INTERVIEW FOR ADMISSION INTO TEACHER EDUCATION

	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient
Professional Awareness and Interest	Student is unable to respond to questions concerning the professional nature of teaching, resources, and day-to-day activities of the school. Student indicates little interest in the profession.	Student indicates a minimal knowledge of the professional nature of teaching, resources, and the day-to-day activities of the school. Student exhibits moderate interest in the profession.	Student responds strongly to questions concerning teaching as a profession. Names specific professional resources, organizations, etc. Is knowledgeable about day-to-day school activities. Student is enthusiastic about teaching.
Verbal Fluency	Student makes grammatical errors, mumbles, mispronounces words, or speaks too softly to be understood. Inadequate vocabulary.	Student makes no grammatical errors, pronounces most words correctly, and speaks clearly and audibly. Vocabulary is limited but appropriate.	Student uses clear voice and correct, precise pronunciation of words. Vocabulary is mature and appropriate.
Personal Appearance	Dress is inappropriate (too casual – jeans, T shirt; too provocative—low cut blouse, short skirt, tight pants, etc.; dirty or wrinkled). Hair is uncombed or dirty. Shoes are athletic or unpolished. Jewelry is excessive. Makeup is excessive.	Dress is appropriately casual (slacks, polo shirt) and well fitting. Clothing is clean and neatly pressed. Hair is clean and neatly groomed. Shoes are polished. Jewelry is not overwhelming. Makeup is not distracting.	Dress is business like (suit with dress shirt and tie or slacks and sport jacket with tie for men, business suit or dress for women. Clothing is clean and well fitting. Hair is clean and neatly groomed. Shoes are unscuffed and polished. Jewelry is appropriate to attire.
Personal Presentation	Student exhibits poor posture, slouches while sitting, and has poor eye contact. Lacks poise and confidence.	Student exhibits good posture and sits erect. Uses appropriate eye contact. May lack poise and confidence.	Student exhibits good posture. Sits erect with legs together and feet on the floor. Exhibits poise and confidence.
Portfolio	Portfolio lacks basic requirements – resume, philosophy, state frameworks, log forms. Paper is poor quality. Writing contains misspellings and/or grammatical errors. Parts are untyped.	Portfolio contains basic requirements – resume, transcript, state frameworks, log forms. Pages are typed and placed in plastic covers. Portfolio is free of spelling and grammatical errors.	Portfolio contains basic requirements and other professional artifacts. Pages are neatly typed and placed in protective covers. Sections are appropriately arranged with table of contents. Creativity is exhibited in cover design and organization.

APPENDIX B

EVALUATION OF TEP INTERVIEW RUBRIC/TRAINING
April 17, 2002

Comments and Suggestions:

- Add an advanced to the rubric for more flexibility in rating. Also, it would like the state-standards for ACTAAP.
- Gives a good idea of how to separate. You have to then use much of your own experience to judge.
- Absolutely!
- The rubric is on target.
- Yes, I think they are on target. The rubric was very helpful and covered each category adequately.
- I feel they are on target and the rubric is clearly stated so the students can clearly understand what is required.
- Yes it is. The information you provided was very helpful.

Video Comments and Suggestions:

- Very good! They were awesome!
- Missed most of. I had Dawson meeting until 12:30. What I saw helped in the process.
- Yes
- Proficient
- Yes – But there needed to be a "pause" button on the VCR so we could discuss each one more thoroughly.
- The videos are a vital part of the training especially for first-time interviewers.
- Excellent help. Thank you.

Suggestions for Remediation of Students Who Receive "Unsatisfactory":

- Hold "staff-development-type" conferences in small groups so as to concentrate on particular weaknesses. More mock-interview sessions, especially after the student-teaching semester. This will enable students to interview with a variety of personalities. Use your ed. administration students and maybe even give a grade to them, too!
- If a student receives an "unsatisfactory" in verbal fluency or has grammatical errors in his/her portfolio, but excels in all other areas, what happens?
- Yes – let them observe the video of the students we observed today. Also, maybe videotape the students who are unsatisfactory and allow them to preview the tape.
- Your counseling should provide the help they need. If they do not improve those things which are pointed out, maybe you don't want them.

Other:

It was a good process! Thanks!

APPENDIX C

_____

Candidate's Name Date

INTERVIEW RATING SHEET

Scoring rubric: 3 = Proficient
2 = Basic
1 = Unsatisfactory

Raters: Please circle the appropriate rating in each category. Comments:

1.	Professional Awareness/Interest:	3	2	1	_____
2.	Verbal Fluency:	3	2	1	_____
3.	Personal Appearance:	3	2	1	_____
4.	Personal Presentation:	3	2	1	_____
5.	Portfolio:	3	2	1	_____

If you rate a student "1" or "3" on any criterion, please write a brief justification on the comment line.

_____ _____

Rater's Signature Date

Note: Students who receive a 2 or above in every category will "pass" the interview requirement for admission into the Teacher Education Program. Students who receive a "1" in any category must meet with the Teacher Education Interview Committee to discuss the results of the interview and steps needed for professional development.

APPENDIX D

INTERVIEW FOR ADMISSION INTO THE TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM

SUGGESTED QUESTIONS

1. Describe how you feel about children.
2. Why do you wish to be a teacher?
3. What does it mean to "be a professional"?
4. How may teachers be models in the community, as well as the classroom?
5. Describe dress, appearance, and hygiene appropriate to teachers.
6. Think of your favorite teacher in your k-12 experience:
   a. Was the teacher excellent in the job or merely popular?
   b. What qualities did you like about this teacher?
   c. What qualities made this person an excellent teacher?
7. Think of your worst teacher:
   a. What characteristics made this person a poor teacher?
   b. How could the teacher have improved?
8. What major values do you hope to teach your students?
9. Why do you think you will be successful in teaching?
10. What is your role in promoting cooperation between you and your peers?
11. Do you think teacher testing for licensure is a good idea? Why or why not?

APPENDIX E
EVALUATION OF TEP INTERVIEW RUBRIC/TRAINING
RESULTS (November 13, 2001)

After you have had a chance to review the rubric for scoring the Teacher Education Interview, please let us know what you think. Do you think the descriptors for "unsatisfactory," "basic," and "proficient" are on target?

Comments and suggestions:

- ok – but still a judgment call
- About the program: This program is great. I have enjoyed interacting with teaching hopefuls. The "crop" looks good! About the rubric: Everybody has to start somewhere, and I applaud you in your beginning rubric. However, I am sure that time present some possibilities of 1+, 2+ ratings.
- Yes, the rubric is effective. It made scoring the candidates less subjective. I think the descriptors are on target.
- Verbal Fluency = one grammatical error moves a person into "1." Take a second look there.
- Personal appearance = What about "business casual" (men)? Slacks, dress shirt, & tie (no jacket)
- The descriptors seem appropriate – anything more would seem artificial and too difficult to use with the time constraints of the interview process. (Note – on rubric sheet unsatisfactory is on left, proficient is on right. On scoring sheet this is reversed – this caused me to err.)
- Eye contact should be added to "proficient" under personal presentation. Portfolio "basic" omits philosophy; Portfolio "unsatisfactory" omits transcripts. None of the students were able to make connections between professional memberships and maintaining professionalism. (Journals, etc.)
- Not comfortable with grading verbal fluency when concerns [sic] is not necessarily grammatical – nonstandard English???
- If a student received one unsatisfactory, then they should not "fail" the interview. It should be brought to their attention and they should fix the problem. The rubric was great to use.
- A great improvement! Perhaps one unsatisfactory should result in "failing" the interview. However, students should be aware of this.
- The descriptors were basically on target. I have a copy of the rubric our district uses for hiring purposes and I will gladly share it, as I will be "borrowing" from Henderson's.
- I like having a rubric. It made me feel as if I was more accurate and objective. Descriptors are fine.
- Yes, they are on target and very helpful. However, there is not really time to adequately evaluate the portfolio in detail. One question the students seemed to have problems with was the one about teaching values to students. Does Henderson offer a course in values instruction?
- Yes. I agree with your thinking that deficient areas should be addressed at an early stage.
- I felt the description worked very well for every one except the portfolio. Need to move "Table of Contents" over to basic category. Then really emphasize the creativity, etc., under proficient.
- I think the rubric for basic fluency should read "no repetitive grammatical errors." That's what we're really concerned about.
- [These comments come from a North Central Evaluator who was on an accreditation visit at HSU and who sat in on one of the interviews.] Yes. I am so impressed with this very descriptive rubric. There should be no misunderstanding about what is expected.

Suggestion: Instead of "proficient," consider "target." This is an NCATE term and quite appropriate.

Give us your opinion on the videos for training. Were they helpful in determining how to rate the criteria as "unsatisfactory," "basic," or "proficient"?

Comments and suggestions:

- 0k -- Rubrics still have loopholes just like 1, 2, 3 ratings.
- The video presentation was a good opener for discussion. The video helped to "see" a positive and not-so-positive interview.
- The videos were very helpful. It was good practice. It was better than going into the session "cold"; I would have liked to see bits of more students than so much of one interview.
- Somewhat
- I did not have the opportunity to view the videos.
- Yes.
- O.K.
- Video very helpful. I enjoyed watching the 3 levels to see what I should be looking for.
- Very helpful.
- The videos were very helpful!
- Videos could be edited to shorter segments and more variety.
- Yes – Very Good.
- Yes. I think that it helped to clarify what represents "unsatisfactory," "basic," or "proficient."
- Good!

Do you have suggestions about how to remediate the performance of a student who receives an "unsatisfactory" on one or more of the criteria?

- One-on-one remediation for grammar Ex. work with English Dept. (Lab)
- Engage the student in authentic conversation. Every time he verbalizes an incorrect grammar point, correct him immediately, each and every time.
- They need an IEP!!
- No – but, I think that becomes the challenge. Remediation is necessary in all class[es], not just a one-time conference after the interviews.
- I feel that this question is so broad, and the potential types of "unsatisfactory" are so numerous.
- One-on-one counseling session. Perhaps a 2nd interview. [Two raters gave this response.]
- Many of the unsatisfactory marks were given in the area of grammatical mistakes. Perhaps the students should be strongly encouraged to have their papers proofread.
- None – I'll have to think about that. It won't be easy. "IEP" type focus – they each need different things.
- Yes, they were helpful, although a little too obvious.
- HELP!!
- I think it should be done in an encouraging way, so the student doesn't feel inferior or inadequate.
- No, but I would suggest that each student be asked at least one question that is not on the list provided to them. This tests how they think on their feet and also illicits [sic] a pure response from them.

APPENDIX F

AACTE NATIONAL PRESENTATION
2/25/02

HSU/TCH Teacher Education Evaluation Interview
Results & Analysis from 11/13/01

OVERALL RESULTS : CATEGORY MATCH ANALYSIS

RATER'S MATCH	PASSED (1st attempt)	FAILED (1st attempt)	TOTAL / %
5 of 5 Categories	60	32	**92 / 70.2%**
4 of 5 Categories	10	7	**17 / 13%**
3 of 5 Categories	9	5	**14 / 10.7%**
2 of 5 Categories	6	1	**7 / 5.3%**
1 of 5 Categories	0	0	**0 / 0%**
0 of 5 Categories	0	0	**0 / 0%**
TOTAL	**86 / 65.6%**	**45 / 34.4%**	**131 / 100%**

OVERALL DIFFERENCES : MISMATCHED CATEGORY ANALYSIS

CATEGORY	3 – 2 MISMATCH	2-1 MISMATCH	3-1 MISMATCH
Prof. Awareness	**9 + 3 = 12**	2	0
Verbal Fluency	**9 + 1 = 10**	3	0
Personal Appear.	**10 + 4 = 14**	1	0
Personal Present.	**10 + 2 = 12**	2	0
Portfolio	**12 + 1 = 13**	1	0
TOTAL	**61**	**9**	**0**
(131 x 5 = 655)	**9.3%**	**1.4%**	

655 – 70 = 585 / 89.3% CATEGORY AGREEMENT

PASSED RESULTS : CATEGORY MATCH ANALYSIS

RATER'S MATCH	TOTAL / %
5 of 5 Categories	**60 / 69.8%**
4 of 5 Categories	**10 / 11.6%**
3 of 5 Categories	**9 / 10.5%**
2 of 5 Categories	**6 / 6.9%**
1 of 5 Categories	**1 / 1.2%**
0 of 5 Categories	**0 / 0%**
TOTAL	**86 / 100%**

PASSED RESULTS : MISMATCHED RESPONSE CATEGORY ANALYSIS

CATEGORY	1 Mismatch	2 Mismatch	3 Mismatch	4 Mismatch	MISMATCHES / %
Prof. Awareness	2	2	4	1	**9 / 18%**
Verbal Fluency	1	4	3	1	**9 / 18%**
Personal Appear.	4	2	3	1	**10 / 20%**
Personal Present.	1	5	4	0	**10 / 20%**
Portfolio	2	5	4	1	**12 / 24%**
					50 / 100%

CATEGORY	1 Mismatch	2 Mismatch	3 Mismatch	4 Mismatch	TOTAL
Prof. Awareness	2	2	4	1	
Verbal Fluency	1	4	3	1	
Personal Appear.	4	2	3	1	
Personal Present.	1	5	4	0	
Portfolio	2	5	4	1	
MISMATCHES	**10 / 1 = 10**	**18 / 2 = 9**	**18 / 3 = 6**	**4 / 4 = 1**	**26**
TOTAL = 86	**11.6%**	**10.4%**	**6.9%**	**1.1%**	**30.2%**

FAILED RESULTS : CATEGORY MATCH ANALYSIS

RATER'S MATCH	TOTAL / %
5 of 5 Categories	**32 / 71.1%**
4 of 5 Categories	**7 / 15.6%**
3 of 5 Categories	**5 / 11.1%**
2 of 5 Categories	**1 / 2.2%**
1 of 5 Categories	**0 / 0%**
0 of 5 Categories	**0 / 0%**
TOTAL	**45 / 100%**

FAILED RESULTS : UNSATISFACTORY CATEGORY ANALYSIS

CATEGORY	1 UNSAT.	2 UNSAT.	3 UNSAT.	4 UNSAT.	UNSAT. HITS / %
Prof. Awareness	0	3	3	1	**7 / 10.9%**
Verbal Fluency	11	5	2	1	**19 / 29.7%**
Personal Appear.	5	2	1	1	**9 / 14.1%**
Personal Present.	1	2	2	1	**6 / 9.4%**
Portfolio	14	8	1	0	**23 / 35.9%**
					64 / 100%

CATEGORY	1 UNSAT.	2 UNSAT.	3 UNSAT.	4 UNSAT.	TOTAL
Prof. Awareness	0	3	3	1	
Verbal Fluency	11	5	2	1	
Personal Appear.	5	2	1	1	
Personal Present.	1	2	2	1	
Portfolio	14	8	1	0	
UNSAT. HITS	**31 / 1 = 31**	**20 / 2 = 10**	**9 / 3 = 3**	**4 / 1 = 1**	**45**
TOTAL = 45	**68.9%**	**22.2%**	**6.7%**	**2.2%**	**100%**

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC®

TM034685

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Examining, Developing, and Validating the Interview for Admission into the Teacher Education Program	
Author(s): Dr. Judy A Harrison, Dr. Donald McAfee, Dr. Ann Caldwell	
Corporate Source: SRATE Annual Meeting	Publication Date: 11-01-02

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☑

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature: Judy A. Harrison	Printed Name/Position/Title: Judy A. Harrison, Director of Teacher Education
Organization/Address: Henderson State University Arkadelphia, AR 71999-0001	Telephone: (870) 230-5427 FAX: (870) 230-5459
	E-Mail Address: harrisj@hsu.edu Date: 11-18-02

(over)